

## TOURIST PERCEPTION TOWARDS TRAVEL RISK IN THE PHILIPPINES: BASIS FOR TRAVEL SECURITY AND SAFETY MEASURES

CELIA E. CARINO

Graduate School, Eulogio Amang Rodriguez, Institute of Science and Technology, Philippines

### ABSTRACT

*The world has experienced various tragic events and natural calamities. In spite of that, a transnational tourist is expected to grow continually and travelers are expected to grow numerically. Travelers are therefore becoming more concerned with safety and security throughout the duration of their international travel. Tourists go on trips to fulfill certain desires, wants, and needs. It is in their interest to reduce every single factor that might have an effect on their safety. Every risk factor perceives by travelers could be a reason for replacing a destination.*

*The Philippines, an archipelago in the Western Pacific Ocean of more than 7,000 islands, is well known for its natural beauty, from white sand beaches and coral reefs, to lush mountains, volcanoes, and brightly-colored rice terraces. As Anton (2012) mentioned the slogan "It's more fun in the Philippines" Every year thousands of tourist visits the country as one of their bucket list for their travel destination whether it is for business or leisure. A major determinant in a traveler's decision to visit a destination is the perception of safety and security. Series of activities may undermine these perceptions of a destination. These circumstances, individually or in a combination have a negative impact on perceptions of safety, security or desirability of a tourist destination. Risk plays a large role in the images that people hold and whether or not people intend to travel to a destination. Tourists play an important role in determining how people perceive risk. It is the possibility of meeting a danger while engaging in travels or the consciousness of security and awareness of the likelihood of damage during travel.*

*Within this study, the researcher focuses on how the respondents perceived travel risk in a destination, the significant difference in the tourist perception as to travel risk when grouped according to local and foreign tourists and proposed travel security and safety measures and determine its acceptability. This paper aimed to investigate the tourist perception toward travel risk and proposed intervention measures to reduce the perceived travel risk in the Philippines.*

*For the methodology of the study, the researcher adopted the descriptive method of research. It is devoted to the gathering of information about preventing the risk of the tourist while in a destination for the purpose of description and interpretation. Burns and Grove (2003) describe a research design as "a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings". With the sample size of fifty (50) local and fifty (50) foreign tourists from the Ninoy Aquino International Airport Terminal 3. The respondents were selected using the purposive sampling techniques. A researcher made survey questionnaire was used as the primary data of the study. The following statistical used were utilized frequency, percentage, weighted mean and t-test.*

*Findings disclosed that tourists agree on travel risk in the Philippines as assessed by both local and foreign respondents. As to significant difference the statistical decision is to accept the null hypotheses. Both respondent groups found the proposed security and safety measures acceptable. It is concluded that the two groups of respondents shared the same assessment moderately agree on the tourist perception towards travel risk in the Philippines. The respondents have parallel perception regarding travel risk in the Philippines. The proposed travel security and safety measures may be adopted by the travelers. The travel and tour operators may consider the proposed travel security and safety measures as part of their orientation before traveling in the Philippines or any part of the world.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Tourist, Travel, Risk, Safety & Security*

**Received:** Mar 12, 2017; **Accepted:** Mar 28, 2017; **Published:** Apr 04, 2017; **Paper Id.:** IJBMRAPR20176

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

The people of the Philippine Island are known for its hospitality especially to visitors, the country hosted millions of tourist's yearly despite of potential travel risk. It is also prone to the usual safety issues plaguing even more developed countries, such as petty crime and small scams. Before planning a trip to this Southeast Asian paradise, it makes sense to read up about general safety in the country. (<http://tx.english-ch.com/teacher/bien/home/safety-and-security-in-philippines>). Risk and tourism are interwoven as the purchase of leisure trip is inherently attached to risk (March and Woodside, 2005) This paper aimed to investigate the tourist perception toward travel risk in the Philippines, determine the significant difference on the perception of the two groups of respondents and proposed travel security and safety measures and its acceptability.

## METHODS

The researcher adopted the descriptive research method to describe data and characteristics used to describe population. It is devoted to the gathering of information about preventing the risk of the tourist while in a destination for the purpose of description and interpretation. Burns and Grove (2003) depicted a research design as "a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings". The participants of the study were the selected fifty (50) local and fifty (50) foreign tourists at the Ninoy Aquino International Airport Terminal I Pasay City using the purposive sampling technique. They were described according to sex, age, educational attainment and civil status. A researcher made survey instrument was used as the primary instrument in data gathering, data's were analyzed using descriptive statistics with simple frequency, percentage, ranking, weighted mean and t-test. The five point Likert Scale and the following ranges of interpretation and remarks were used in the study where 5 is the highest rated as Strongly Agree /Highly Acceptable, 4 is Agree/Acceptable, 3 Moderately Agree/Moderately Acceptable, 2 Disagree/ Least Acceptable, and the lowest is 1 rated as Strongly Disagree/Not Acceptable.

## RESULTS

### Formula and Equations

The study utilized the following statistical data: Percentage. This was used to get the frequency of each value or class interval express as a percentage of the total number of observations derived by multiplying each of the relative frequency values by 100.

Formula:

$$\% = fxN/100$$

Where: % = percentage

f = frequency of occurrence

N = Number of respondents

Weighted mean. The sample mean of the variable is the sum of observed values in a data divided by the number of observation (Isotalo, 2014).

$$\bar{\chi} = \frac{\sum f_i \chi_i}{n}$$

Where:  $f_i$  = weighted given to reach responses

$\chi_i$  = number or responses

$n$  = total number of cases

The researcher used the following verbal interpretation to further interpret the numerical results as to the tourist perception toward travel risk and the acceptability of the proposed travel security and safety measures.

**The Five-Point Likert Scale** and the following ranges of interpretation and remarks are used in the study:

Scale	Remarks	Range
5	Highly Acceptable (HA)/Strongly Agree (SA)	4.20 - 5.00
4	Acceptable (A)/ Agree (A)	3.40 - 4.19
3	Moderately Acceptable (MA)/ Moderately Agree (MA)	2.60 - 3.39
2	Least Acceptable (LA) / Disagree (D)	1.80 - 2.59
1	Not Acceptable (NA)/ Strongly Disagree (SD)	1.00 - 1.79

t-test for Dependent samples. The t-test was used to compare the assessments of the local and foreign tourists.

Formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

Where:

$X_1$  – mean of the first group

$X_2$  – mean of the second group

$S_1$  – variance of the first group

$S_2$  – variance of the second group

$N_1$  – number of students in the first group

$N_2$  – number of students in the second group

The critical t-value at 0.5 level of significance (alpha level) with respective degrees of freedom was used to set region of acceptance and rejection.

## Figures and Table

**Table 1: Respondents of the Study**

Sex	Local		Foreign		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Male	19	38	14	28	33	33
Female	31	62	36	72	67	67
<b>Total</b>	50	100	50	100	100	100
<b>Civil Status</b>						
Married	36	72	39	78	75	75
Single	14	28	9	18	23	23
Widow/widower	0	0	1	2	1	1
Legally Separated	0	0	1	2	1	1
<b>Total</b>	50	100	50	100	100	100
<b>Educational Attainment</b>						
Elementary	1	2	2	4	3	3
High school Graduate	24	48	26	52	50	50
College Graduate	25	50	22	44	47	47
<b>Total</b>	50	100	50	100	100	100

### Sub problem No. 1. How do the respondents perceive the travel risk in the Philippines?

**Table 2: Local Tourists Perception towards Travel Risk**

Travel Risk	WM	VI	Rank
1. Transportation	3.16	MA	5
2. Accommodation	3.08	MA	7
3. Food and Beverages	2.96	MA	9
4. Attractions	3.12	MA	6
5. Scam	4.38	SA	1
6. Entertainment	2.78	MA	10
7. Facilities and Amenities in a Destination	3.06	MA	8
8. Activities	3.34	MA	3
9. Kidnapping	3.28	MA	4
10. Robbery	3.62	A	2
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>MA</b>	

Legend: 4.20 - 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.40 - 4.19 = Agree; 2.60 - 3.39 = Moderately Agree; 1.80 - 2.59 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.79 = Strongly Disagree

As presented in the data in Table 2, the Local respondents assessed item 5 which is “Scam” as strongly agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 4.38 as rank 1; item 10 which is “Robbery” assessed as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.62 as rank 2; item 8 which is “Activities” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.34 as rank 3; item 9 which is “Kidnapping” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.28 in rank 4; item 1 which is “Transportation” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.16 as rank 5; item 4 which is “Attractions” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.12 as rank 6; item 2 which is “Accommodation” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.08 as rank 7; item 7 which is “Facilities and Amenities in a Destination” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.06 as rank 8; item 3 which is “Food and Beverages” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 2.96 as rank 9; and item 6 which is “Entertainment” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 2.78 as rank 10, respectively. As a whole, the assessment of the local on travel risks was

Moderately Agree by the obtained overall composite weighted mean value of 3.28.

**Table 3: Foreign Tourists Perception towards Travel Risk**

Travel Risk	WM	VI	Rank
1. Transportation	4.06	A	2
2. Accommodation	2.94	MA	9
3. Food and Beverages	3.52	A	5
4. Attractions	3.68	A	3
5. Scam	4.24	SA	1
6. Entertainment	3.22	MA	8
7. Facilities and Amenities in a Destination	2.22	SD	10
8. Activities	3.34	MA	7
9. Kidnapping	3.66	A	4
10. Robbery	3.40	A	6
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>A</b>	

Legend: 4.20 - 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.40 - 4.19 = Agree; 2.60 - 3.39 = Moderately Agree; 1.80 - 2.59 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.79 = Strongly Disagree

As depicted in Table 3, the foreign respondents assessed item 5 which is “Scam” as strongly agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 4.24 as rank 1; item 1 which is “Transportation” assessed as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 4.06 as rank 2; item 4 which is “Attractions” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.68 as rank 3; item 9 which is “kidnapping” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.66 as rank 4; item 3 which is “Food and Beverages” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.52 as rank 5; item 10 which is “Robbery” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.40 as rank 6; item 7 which is “Scam” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.34 as rank 7; item 8 which is “Activities” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.22 as rank 8; item 2 which is “Accommodation” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 2.94 as rank 9; and item 7 which is “Facilities and Amenities in a Destination” assessed as moderately risky supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 2.22 as rank 10, respectively. In sum, the assessment of the foreign on travel risks was moderately agreed by the obtained overall composite weighted mean value of 3.43.

**Table 4: Summary Table on the Assessment of Tourists Perception towards Travel Risk**

Travel Risk	Local		Foreign		Composite Weighted Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Transportation	3.16	MA	4.06	A	3.61	A	2
2. Accommodation	3.08	MA	2.94	A	3.01	MA	8
3. Food and Beverages	2.96	MA	3.52	A	3.24	MA	7
4. Attractions	3.12	MA	3.68	A	3.40	A	5
5. Scam	4.38	SA	4.24	SA	4.31	SA	1
6. Entertainment	2.78	MA	3.22	MA	3.00	MA	9
7. Facilities and Amenities in a Destination	3.06	MA	2.22	SD	2.34	SD	10
8. Activities	3.34	MA	3.34	MA	3.34	MA	6
9. Kidnapping	3.28	MA	3.66	A	3.47	A	4
10. Robbery	3.62	A	3.40	A	3.51	A	3
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>A</b>	

Legend: 4.20 - 5.00 = Strongly Agree; 3.40 - 4.19 = Agree; 2.60 - 3.39 = Moderately Agree; 1.80 - 2.59 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.79 = Strongly Disagree

As manifested in the summary table, it can be deducted that the local and foreign respondents generally assessed item 5 which is “Scam” assessed as strongly agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 4.31 as rank 1; item 1 which is “Transportation” as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.61 as rank 2; item 10 which is “robbery” assessed as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.51 as rank 3; item 9 which is “kidnapping” assessed as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.47 as rank 4; item 4 which is “Attractions” assessed as agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.40 as rank 5; item 8 which is “Activities” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.34 as rank 6; item 3 which is “Food and Beverages” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.24 as rank 7; item 2 which is “Accommodations” assessed as moderately risky supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.01 as rank 8; item 6 which is “Entertainment” assessed as moderately agree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.00 as rank 9; item 7 which is “Facilities and Amenities in a Destination” assessed as strongly disagree supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 2.64 as rank 10, respectively. Generally, a moderately agree travel risk as assessed by both the local and foreign respondents supported by the obtained overall composite weighted mean value of 3.35.

**Sub problem No. 2. Is there significant difference of the perception of the tourist towards travel risk in the Philippines when grouped according to local and foreign tourists?**

**Table 5: Significant Difference on the Assessment of Respondents**

Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-ratio		
			Computer t Value	Decision	VI
Local	3.28	1.15	0.6969	Accept $H_0$	Not Significant
Foreign	3.43	1.02			

**Critical t value= 1.6626**

**Degree of freedom= 99**

It could be noticed from the data in Table 4, that the computed t value of 0.6969 less than the t critical value of 1.6626 at five percent level of significance with 99 degrees of freedom. The statistical decision is to accept the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of the tourists toward travel risk in the Philippines. This implies that the local respondents share a common perception toward Travel Risk with the foreign respondents

**Sub-problem No. 3. Based on the findings what travel security and safety measures may be proposed?**

**Table 6: Proposed Travel Security and Safety Measures**

1. Transact with local license tour operators and accredited by the Department of Tourism in the Philippines.
2. Look for accommodation accredited by the Department of Tourism and recommended by travel associations.
3. Dine on food establishments recommended by travel and tour operators and accredited by destination management organizations.
4. Visit Philippines Embassies or consulates for foreign tourist, for local tourist coordinate with local government units.
5. Ensure that the activities provided are certified by professionals with regard to safety.
6. Practice self-awareness and discipline.

<b>Table 6 Continuous .....</b>
7. Consult with the local travel operators either online or personal visit as to facilities and amenities in a particular destination.
8. Do not be too trusting; always deal with precautions to the people that you meet. Do not bring valuables.
9. Never venture to unknown places or sites.
10. Register at the Police station upon to a destination.

**Sub-problem No. 4. How acceptable is the proposed travel security and safety measures?**

**Table 7: Acceptability of the Proposed Travel Security and Safety Measures**

	Local		Foreign		Computed Weighted Mean		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The proposed travel safety and security measures could be adopted by the tourist.	4.46	HA	4.38	HA	4.42	HA	1
2. The proposed travel safety and security measures can be made clear to all concerned.	3.44	A	4.50	HA	3.97	A	2
3. The proposed travel safety and security measures are workable and operative.	3.72	A	4.04	A	3.88	A	3
4. The proposed travel safety and security measures can be of create use and benefit to the tourist.	3.18	MA	4.50	HA	3.84	A	6
5. The proposed travel safety and security measures can be utilized under the variety of circumstances.	4.32	HA	3.42	A	3.87	A	4
6. The proposed travel safety and security measures is suitable to all travelers not only in the Philippines but to other countries as well.	2.78	MA	3.42	A	3.10	MA	10
7. The proposed travel safety and security measures can be carried out by competent and reliable to travel operators.	3.68	A	3.54	A	3.61	A	8
8. The proposed travel safety and security measures contents are diverse and adequate.	3.48	A	3.28	MA	3.38	MA	9
9. The proposed travel safety and security measures are specific and achievable.	3.76	A	3.96	A	3.86	A	5
10. The proposed travel safety and security measures are relevant and responsive to the needs of the tourist.	4.02	A	3.52	A	3.77	A	7
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>A</b>	

Legend: 4.20 - 5.00 = Highly Acceptable; 3.40 - 4.19 = Acceptable; 2.60 - 3.39 = Moderately Acceptable; 1.80 - 2.59 = Least Acceptable; 1.00 - 1.79 = Not Acceptable

As portrayed in table 7, it can be deducted that the local and foreign respondents generally assessed item 1 is “The proposed travel safety and security measures could be adopted by the tourist.” assessed as highly acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 4.42 as rank 1; item 2 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures can be made clear to all concerned” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.97 as rank 2;

item 3 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures are workable and operative” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.88 as rank 3; item 5 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures can be utilized under the variety of circumstances” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.87 as rank 4; item 9 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures are specific and achievable” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.86 as rank 5; item 4 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures can be of create use and benefit to the tourist” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.84 as rank 6; item 10 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures are relevant and responsive to the needs of the tourist” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.77 as rank 7; item 7 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures can be carried out by competent and reliable to travel operators” assessed as acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.61 as rank 8; item 8 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures contents are diverse and adequate” assessed as moderately acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.38 as rank 9; item 6 which is “The proposed travel safety and security measures is suitable to all travelers not only in the Philippines but to other countries as well” assessed as moderately acceptable supported by the obtained weighted mean value of 3.10 as rank 10, respectively. Generally, a agree Travel Risk assessed by both the local and foreign respondents supported by the obtained overall composite weighted mean value of 3.77.

The paper shows that the local and foreign tourists moderately agree on their perception towards travel risk in the Philippines supported by the obtained overall weighted mean of 3.35. The assessment of the two groups of respondents revealed that the computed t value of 0.6969 is less than the t critical value of 1.6626 with 99 degrees of freedom at five percent level of significance. The statistical decision is to accept the null hypothesis and verbally interpreted as not significant. The proposed travel security and safety measures can be used as a guide for tourist who are planning and considering to visit the Philippines and may be adopted by local and foreign travel and tour operators. The tourist perceptions towards travel risk as assessed by the local and foreign respondents supported by the obtained overall weighted mean value of 3.77 and verbally interpreted as acceptable.

Overall, the paper closes with the two groups of respondents shared the same assessment moderately agree on the tourist perception towards travel risk in the Philippines, the respondents have parallel perception regarding travel risk in the Philippines, the proposed travel security and safety measures may be adopted by the tourist and the travel and tour operators may consider the proposed travel security and safety measures as part of their orientation before travelling in the Philippines or any part of the world.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY**

The researcher would like to give her profound gratitude and sincerest heartfelt appreciation to the following persons for their effort in the accomplishment and success of this paper. To the administration of Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology for the financial support all throughout the process in making the research. To my colleagues in the graduate school for their support, guidance and valuable ideas whom they share without hesitation in making this paper possible. To the Vice President for Planning Research, Extension and production for sharing his wisdom guiding the researcher in making her statistical analysis. My deepest appreciation to my family and friends for their unconditional love, moral support, encouragement and believing in this undertaking.



## CONCLUSIONS

This document and the information in it are provided in confidence for the sole purpose of exploring research opportunities between the disclosing party and the receiving party concerning Tourist Perception Towards Travel Risk in the Philippines: Basis for Security and Safety Measures and may not be disclosed to any third party or used for any other purpose without the written permission of the disclosing party.

## REFERENCES

1. Anton, New DOT Slogan: It's more fun in the Philippines. Retrieved <http://www.thehappytrip.com/2012/01/new-dot-slogan-its-more-fun-in-the-philippines/>
2. Burns, SN & Grove, SK. 2003. *Understanding nursing research*. 3rd edition. Philadelphia: Saunders. Retrieved <http://www.ais.utm.my/researchportal/files/2015/02/Example3-ResearchDesign.pdf>
3. Garg, A. (2012) A study of Tourist perception towards travel risks factors in tourist decision making. Retrieved [www.academea.edu](http://www.academea.edu).
4. Isotalo, J. (2014) *Basics of Statistics*. Retrieved [https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Basics\\_of\\_Statistics.html?id=uUSvoQEACAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Basics_of_Statistics.html?id=uUSvoQEACAAJ&redir_esc=y)
5. Teacher Bien Retrieved <http://tx.english-ch.com/teacher/bien/home/safetyand-security-in-Philippines>
6. March R. and Woodside A.G., (2005) *Tourism behaviour: Travelers decisions and actions*, CABI Publishing, Wallingford Retrieved [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247230734\\_R\\_March\\_and\\_AG\\_Woodside\\_Tourism\\_behaviour\\_Travellers\\_decisions\\_and\\_actions\\_CABI\\_Publishing\\_Wallingford\\_2005\\_ISBN\\_0-85199-0215\\_vii280pp\\_55](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247230734_R_March_and_AG_Woodside_Tourism_behaviour_Travellers_decisions_and_actions_CABI_Publishing_Wallingford_2005_ISBN_0-85199-0215_vii280pp_55)

